

## REMARKS

In this Response, Applicants cancel claims 8, 17, 26, and 34, amend claims 1, 10, 19, and 28, and remove the bases for the Examiner's rejections. Cancellations of and amendments to the claims are being made solely to expedite prosecution of the present application and do not constitute an acquiescence to any of the Examiner's rejections. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found throughout the application. Applicants reserve the option to further prosecute the same or similar claims in the present or a subsequent application. Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 1-7, 9-16, 18-25, 27-33, and 35 are pending in the present application.

### Petition for Extension of Time

As provided in accompanying documents, Applicants petition for a one-month extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) in which to file this Response.

### Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 9-16, 18-25, 27-33, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mousseau in view of Kadyk.

The Examiner also rejected claims 7, 9, 16, 18, 25, 27, 33, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mousseau in view of Kadyk and Landgren.

The Examiner also rejected claims 8, 17, 26, and 34 as being unpatentable over Mousseau in view of Kadyk, Landgren, and De Boor.

### *Claims 1-7 and 9*

Applicants' independent claim 1 is directed to a method of transferring data to a wireless device over a wireless communications network. Among other things, Applicants' independent claim 1 deals with a first server that communicates with the wireless device and a second server that communicates with the first server. The first server receives from the wireless device a request for data and a wireless device type, and the first server interacts with the second server to obtain the data requested by the wireless device. Subsequently, the first server parses the requested data to remove data that is not displayable on the wireless

device, in which the removed data is dependent upon the wireless device type. The first server then transmits the parsed requested data to the wireless device.

Mosseau describes a system for restricting the information that is transmitted by a gateway device in reply to a request from a handheld viewing device. As described in Mosseau col. 6, ll. 16-30, a user of the handheld device can request information (e.g., a page from a web site) and establish filters for filtering portions of the information from subsequent transmission to the user. Thereafter, when the gateway receives a request from the user for the information, the gateway applies the user's previously established filters to the information, and transmits the thusly filtered information to the user. (Mosseau col. 5, ll. 60-63, col. 6, ll. 5-15, and FIG 3.) The gateway also applies its own filters to the information prior to transmission to the user; these filters automatically remove advanced HTML commands and Java content. (Mosseau col. 5, l. 66 to col. 6, ll. 4 and FIG. 3.)

In contrast to Applicants' independent claim 1, Mosseau does not receive an identification of the wireless device's type from the wireless device. Indeed, as stated by the Examiner, Mosseau "does not disclose including an identification of a wireless device type transmitted from the wireless device." Mosseau does not, therefore, teach or suggest at least the feature of Applicants' independent claim 1 directed to receiving an identification of a wireless device type from a wireless device.

Kadyk describes a gateway that can transmit a message from an originating device to a destination device. After receiving a message from the originating device, Kadyk's locator module identifies the destination device's type from a look-up table in a mass memory. (Kadyk col. 10, ll. 42-44, col. 10, l. 63 to col. 11, l. 15, col. 11, l. 67 to col. 12, l. 17, and Fig. 4.) Kadyk does not teach or suggest how to establish and/or populate that look-up table.

In contrast to Applicants' independent claim 1, Kadyk does not receive an identification of the destination device type's from the destination device. Instead, Kadyk identifies the destination device's type from a look-up table whose origin is neither taught nor suggested. Kadyk does not, therefore, teach or suggest at least the feature of independent claim 1 directed to receiving an identification of a wireless device type from a wireless device.

As such, neither Mosseau nor Kadyk teaches or suggests the feature of Applicants' independent claim 1 directed to receiving an identification of a wireless device type from a wireless device. Since neither Mosseau's system nor Kadyk's system receives that wireless

device type, neither Mosseau nor Kadyk can teach or suggest the features of Applicants' independent claim 1 directed to parsing data requested by the wireless device to remove data that is not displayable based on that wireless device type and transmitting the thusly parsed requested data to the wireless device.

In summary, neither Mosseau or Kadyk, whether considered separately or in combination, teaches or suggests all the features of Applicants' independent claim 1. Independent claim 1 is, therefore, allowable. Since independent claim 1 is allowable, claims 2-7 and 9 that depend therefrom are also allowable, thereby mooting the Examiner's rejections of those claims.

*Claims 10-16, 18-25, 27-33, and 35*

Applicant's independent claims 10, 19, and 28 are directed to methods and systems and include features that are similar to independent method claim 1. Applicant's independent claims 10, 19, and 28 are therefore allowable for the reasons provided with respect to independent claim 1. Since independent claims 10, 19, and 28 are allowable, claims 11-16, 18, 20-25, 27, 29-33, and 35 that depend therefrom are also allowable, thereby mooting the Examiner's rejections of those claims.

**CONCLUSION**

On the basis of the foregoing Amendment and Remarks, this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request allowance.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' Attorney if issues are deemed to remain prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 15, 2004

  
Allan A. Fanucci (Reg. No. 30,256)

**WINSTON & STRAWN LLP**  
**CUSTOMER NO. 28765**  
(212) 294-3311